This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents will not correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.



United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/541,845	04/03/2000	Jodi A. Dalvey	946.008US1	4258
75	90 08/22/2002			
James A. Sheridan Thomas Moser & Patterson, LLP 4149-B El Camino Way			EXAMINER	
			HESS, BRUCE H	
Palo Alto, CA	94306-4036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1774	

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
09/541,8	45 04/03/00	DALVEY	J	946.008US1
			EXAMINER	
TAMES A	SHERIDAN	IM22/0724		
	OSER & PATTERS	SON, LLP	ART-UNTE	PAPER NUMBER
4149-B El	L C <mark>AMINO WAY</mark> D CA 94306-400		1774	5
			DATE MAILED:	
	ion from the examiner in ch PATENTS AND TRADEM			·
A shortened statutory	nas been examined	Responsive to communication filed on action is set to expire month(s),	30 days fro	This action is made final.
Failure to respond wit	hin the period for response	will cause the application to become abandor	ed. 35 U.S.C. 133	
Part I THE FOLLO	WING ATTACHMENT(S) A	ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:		
3. Notice of A	References Cited by Exami Art Cited by Applicant, PTC n on How to Effect Drawing	0-1449. 4. Noti		tent Drawing Review, PTO-948. Application, PTO-152.
Part II SUMMARY	OF ACTION			
1. Claims	1	-2O		are pending in the application.
2. Claims				_ have been cancelled.
3. Claims				are allowed.
4. Claims				_ are rejected.
5. Claims				_ are objected to.
6. Claims_	1-	Σ Θ	re subject to restricti	and requirement.
7. This applicat	ion has been filed with info	rmal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are	acceptable for exam	ination purposes.
8. Formal draw	ings are required in respon	se to this Office action.		
9. The correcte are accep	nd or substitute drawings ha ptable;	ave been received on see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Pater	Under 37 (nt Drawing Review, F	C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings PTO-948).
	d additional or substitute s	heet(s) of drawings, filed on niner (see explanation).	has (have) been	approved by the
11. The propose	d drawing correction, filed	, has been appro	ved; disapproved	I (see explanation).
		for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified at no; filed on		received not been received
		condition for allowance except for formal matt parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	ers, prosecution as t	o the merits is closed in
14. Other				

Application/Control Number: 09/ 541, 845

Art Unit: 1774

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- 1. Claims 1 16, drawn to Articles and methods of using the same, classified in class 428, subclass 195.
 - II. Claims 17 20, drawn to Methods of making, classified in class 427, subclass 146.
- 2. Inventions 1.(I) and 2.(II) are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (e.g., add the titanium oxide to the polymer while it is being formed, not after).
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

- 4. In the event of the election of the group I invention, the following election of species are also required. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: An image transfer sheet and method of using the same wherein a white pigment is added to
 - A. A release layer (claims 4 and 8): or

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/541, 845

Art Unit: 1774

An image - imparting layer (claims 5, 6 and 9).

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, 1-3, 7 and 10-16 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Page 4

Art Unit: 1774

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Hess/h.h

July 24, 2001

BRUCE H. HESS PRIMARY EXAMINER